



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,759	02/26/2002	Makoto Fukumoto	MM4522	2261

7590 11/12/2004

Anderson, Kill & Olick, P.C.  
1251 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10020-1182

EXAMINER

PSITOS, ARISTOTELIS M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2653

DATE MAILED: 11/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/083,759	<b>Applicant(s)</b> FUKUMOTO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Aristotelis M Psitos	<b>Art Unit</b> 2653	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/26/02 &amp; 8/23/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 2653

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Priority***

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

### ***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the last three steps as found in claims 1 and 8 (emphasizing the "interpolation") as well as the interpolating ability as recited in claim 4 & 9 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement-drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The submitted IDS have been reviewed and made of record with the exception of the submitted JP report since it is in Japanese and no English equivalent exists.

Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome the rejections because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

Art Unit: 2653

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

In particular both independent claims 1 and 8 require/recite a tracking offset characteristics obtaining limitation relying upon "interpolating said first measured characteristic values". There is no disclosure in the remainder of the specification as to how such interpolation is performed/accomplished.

Similar reasoning applies to claims 4 and 9, which additionally require an interpolation of the laser power characteristic.

The remaining dependent claims fail to define/support such missing ability and fall with their respective parent claim.

IN as far the examiner interprets the claims, the following art rejections are made.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 2653

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Mashimo or JP 2000-285485 either further considered with Hiratsuka et al/Kamioka et al.

With respect to Mashimo, this document discloses a te system having appropriate offset abilities, and appropriate servo control for maximizing the te signal. Furthermore, Mashimo also includes the ability of recording test signals in the appropriate locations for their power level control ability.

JP 2000-285485 also discusses such a system – applicants' attention is also drawn to the attached MAT (machine assisted translation), note in particular paragraph 20 which discusses such.

The documents lack any discussion with respect to "interpolating" the te-offset signals accordingly.

Hiratsuka et al/Kamioka et al teach in this environment the ability of having "interpolation" filters or an interpolation of the te signal respectively included in the te (offset) circuitry, the reason is to ensure a better tracking signal – see the abstract for instance.

It would have been obvious to modify the base system of Mashimo or JP 2000-285485 with the additional teaching from Hiratsuka et al <sup>or Kamioka et al</sup> motivation is as discussed in Hiratsuka et al for the advancement of a better tracking error signal.

3. Claims 2 & 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the art as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of either Kono or JP 3057875.

Art Unit: 2653

None of the above documents specify the "frames". Although the examiner concludes such "frame" ability is inherently present in the above systems, such abilities/limitations are further specified by either Kono or JP 3057875 submitted by applicants.

It would have been obvious to modify the base systems as relied above in paragraph 2 with the additional ability of having the test signals appropriately recording in a plurality of frames, motivation is to ensure the proper recording power level across the record medium.

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the art as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of JP 2000-298862.

With respect to the limitations of claim 7, the examiner considers such as being present in the cited/present JP document – note in particular the abstract and that the curves as noted in 2B can be mathematically expressed in quadratic terminology.

Hence the examiner concludes that the claim is attempting to define the te offset as requiring envelope detection ability, which is the point behind the JP document.

It would have been obvious to modify the base system references/relied upon in paragraph 2 above with the additional envelope detection ability noted in the JP document, motivation is to provide for an appropriate tilt control in the system.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. JP 5-144004 and 2000-244054 are cited as illustrative of prior art testing signal control abilities in this environment.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aristotelis M Psitos whose telephone number is (703) 308-1598. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thursday 8 - 4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William R. Korzuch can be reached on (703) 305-6137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2653

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Aristotelis M Psitos  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2653



AMP